

REMARKS

The Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the comments set forth in the Final Office Action of February 24, 2004. Additionally, the Applicants had the opportunity to discuss comments set forth in the Office Action of February 24, 2004 with the Examiner and the Primary Examiner. Amendment, reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

In the Office Action mailed February 24, 2004;

Claims 1-4, 6-21, 24-38 and 41-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,583,925 to Bernstein ("Bernstein") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,206,901 to Harlow et al. ("Harlow"); and

Claims 5, 22, 23, 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein in view of Harlow and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,578 to Brennan et al. ("Brennan").

Telephone Interview Summary

The participation of the Examiner Ms. Quynh H. Nguyen and the Primary Examiner Mr. Ahmad Matar in a telephone interview with the representative of the Applicants, Mr. Thomas Tillander, on March 10, 2004 is noted with appreciation. In that interview, Mr. Tillander highlighted aspects of the present application that distinguish over the Bernstein and Harlow references. The Primary Examiner acknowledged differences between the highlighted aspects and the references. However, the Primary Examiner expressed the opinion that the highlighted aspects were not recited in the claims. With particular reference to **claim 1**, Mr. Tillander explained that the aspects were recited in the claims. The Primary Examiner was not convinced and suggested that amendments could clarify **claim 1**. Alternative claim language for elements (a) and (d) was discussed. In conclusion, it was agreed that language indicating that a primary directory number is the number that is entered or dialed when placing a call and that language indicating that a plurality of answering events are monitored would render **claim 1** allowable.

The Claims are Not Obvious

Claim 1 has been amended to recite receiving an incoming call leg as the result of a person placing the incoming call leg to a primary directory number, the incoming

call leg designating the primary directory number, determining a plurality of secondary directory numbers associated with the primary directory number, processing and routing an outgoing call leg associated with each secondary directory number of the plurality of secondary directory numbers to form a plurality of outgoing call legs, monitoring the plurality of outgoing call legs for a plurality of answering events and connecting outgoing call legs associated with the plurality of answering events to the incoming call leg for a multiple leg telecommunication conferencing session.

In the telephone interview of March 10, 2004, the Primary Examiner agreed that amendments such as these would render **claim 1** allowable. Similar amendments have been made to independent **claims 18, 35 and 50**.

The amendments to the claims are supported throughout the specification. For example, that a primary directory number (primary DN) is the number used to place a call is made clear in the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 29 and ending on page 8, line 9 (see page 8, lines 1 and 2 in particular). That a plurality of answering events is monitored is made clear for example, at page 11, lines 24-26. Additionally, the amendments to the claims are supported in FIG. 5 and on page 18, lines 17-page 20, line 20.

For at least the foregoing reasons, and those expressed in papers previously filed by the Applicants, it is respectfully submitted that **claims 1-57** are unanticipated and are not obvious in light of Bernstein, Harlow and Brennan taken alone or in any combination.

In the interests of advancing this application to issue the Applicant(s) respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

Claims 1-57 remain in the application. For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. An early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP


April 2, 2004
Date



Joseph D. Dreher
Reg. No. 37,123
Thomas Tillander
Reg. No. 47,334
1100 Superior Avenue
7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AF, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:	
EV 341152613 US	
	Date
	<u>April 2</u> , 2004

	Signature
	Printed Name
Stephanie Weinhardt	